

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the current subject matter is respectfully requested.
No new matter has been added.

35 USC § 101

Claims 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because allegedly the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed. First, it is submitted that polling a repository necessary requires a computer system (as one cannot poll a data repository by hand or other mechanisms). Notwithstanding, claim 29 has been amended to clarify that the repositories are parts of computer systems and to provide a pre-ambble further clarify the computer implemented nature of the method. Second, it is submitted that claim 30 as previously submitted also is tied to a statutory category in that the graphical user interface is rendered on a client computer. Notwithstanding, claim 30 has been amended to clarify that the user-generated input is received via the graphical user interface.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4-17 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srimuang (U.S. pre-grant publication number 2003/0061087 in view of Kalmes U.S. Patent No. 6,934,715. Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glazer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,174,303) in view of Kalmes U.S. Patent No. 6,934,715, and further in view of Miller (U.S. pre-grant publication number 2003/0036925). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "wherein: the task items include a human resource skill requirement, the human resource information includes a indication of a skill possessed by particular human resources that are represented in the human resource information, and the engine associates a particular human resource with a particular task item only when the indication of the skill possessed by the particular human resource matches the human resource skill requirement of the task item, wherein there is at least one human resource that possesses the skill but at a level that does not match the human resource skill requirement of the task item" (for support, see, *inter alia*, published specification par. 59, previous claim 10).

Claim 11 has been amended to recite: "the task items include a tool characteristic requirement, the reusable resource information includes an indication of a tool characteristic for particular tools that are represented in the reusable resource information, and the engine associates a particular tool with a particular task item only when the indication of the tool characteristic for a particular tool matches the tool characteristic of the task item, wherein there is at least one particular tool that includes the tool characteristic requirement but at a level that does not match the tool characteristic of the task item (for support, see, *inter alia*, specification par. 59).

Srimuang describes an arrangement in which a customer may schedule a single service appointment to occur during some desired time interval and a scheduling program may specifically schedule the various people and resources for only the portions of the service time interval where they will be needed. For example, if an appointment for a medical exam is to last one hour, the appointment may require: (1) a nurse for the first 10 minutes of the hour and the last 20 minutes of the hour; (2) an examination room for the first 20 minutes and last 20 minutes of the hour; (3) an x-ray room for the middle 20 minutes of the hour; and (4) a doctor for the final 30 minutes of the hour. In this case, the calendars for the nurse, the

doctor, the x-ray room and the exam room can be scheduled only for the respective periods that they are actually required. (see, *inter alia*, Srimuang par. 13).

The claims were amended, in part, to clarify the differences between the current subject matter and the cited references, including Srimuang. With Srimuang healthcare appointments that pertain to different human resources (e.g., nurse, doctor, x-ray technician, etc.) can be scheduled using a scheduling program. Such human resources differ from that in the recited claims which pertain to a level of skill (which differs from that of human resources). As an example, a mechanic might be required that has skill level of medium. With the recited arrangement, there may be mechanics with skill levels of low that are available during a needed time slot, however, such mechanics will not be scheduled. Such an arrangement provides enhanced usability, especially when dealing with numerous human resources of varying skill levels.

Similarly, examination rooms and x-ray rooms do not suggest tools having different levels of tool characteristics as recited in claim 11. Rather, such rooms simply describe locations in which different tools are available (e.g., x-ray machine, etc.).

Therefore, the skilled artisan would not have resulted in the subject matter of claims 1 or 11 by combining Srimuang and Kalmes.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

Claim 29 was amended to clarify that automated nature of the method so that service orders that include a plurality of tasks can be automatically associated with a person, a non-reusable resource, and a reusable resource by polling a first repository. Glazer describes an arrangement in which customer appointments are scheduled according to customer parameters. Such an arrangement fails to suggest non-reusable and reusable resources (rather Glazer is describing restrictions on the person's schedule). Moreover, Glazer fails to suggest that there are contractual obligations that are used to schedule a service order as recited in

claim 29. Moreover, Kalmes describes an arrangement in which a user may access a repository in order to determine whether contractual obligations can be met (see, *inter alia*, Kalmes col. 7, lines 16-20). In contrast, the recited subject matter utilizes contractual obligations to automatically schedule service orders. Therefore, the skilled artisan would not have combined Glazer and Kalmes to result in the subject matter of claim 29.

Accordingly, claims 29 and 30 should be allowable.

New claim 31 recites: "A computer-implemented method comprising: associating, based on user input, resource information with task items that need to be completed as part of performing a service action by an engine; and first polling a first repository of a first computer system to obtain resource information associable with the task items, the repository including human resource information, reusable resource information, and non-reusable resource information, wherein: the human resource information includes availability information for human resources, the reusable resource information includes availability information for reusable resources, the non-reusable resource information includes availability information for non-reusable resources; second polling a remote repository of a remote computer system different than the first computer system to obtain non-resource constraint information for the service action, the second polling occurring after the first polling; and scheduling resources needed to perform the service action based on results obtained from the repository of resource information as limited by the non-resource constraint information obtained from the remote computer system, wherein the second polling automatically checks whether a proposed schedule determined by the first polling complies with the non-resource constraint information in the remote repository; wherein: the task items include a tool characteristic requirement, the reusable resource information includes an indication of a tool characteristic for particular tools that are represented in the reusable resource information, and the engine associates a particular tool with a particular

task item only when the indication of the tool characteristic for a particular tool matches the tool characteristic of the task item, wherein there is at least one particular tool that includes the tool characteristic requirement but at a level that does not match the tool characteristic of the task item” (for support, see, *inter alia*, specification par. 59).

Claim 31 recites similar limitations to that of claim 11 and previous claim 1, and as a result, claim 31 should be allowable based on similar reasoning to that described above.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Applicant : Renzo Colle *et al.*
Serial No. : 10/696,498
Filed : October 30, 2003

Attorney's Docket No.: 34874-374 / 2002P10209US02

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-374.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 12, 2008

/ck3/
Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Address all written correspondence to
Customer No. 64280
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Phone: 858.314.1500
Fax: 858.314.1501